## REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10, and 12-15 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-8, 10, and 12-15 stand rejected. Claims 1, 10, and 12-14 have been amended herein. Claims 12-14 have been amended to overcome informalities cited by the Examiner. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-8, 10, and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wise et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,884,262) in view of Birdwell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,108,706) and Brodsky (U.S. Pat. No. 5,809,471). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding, independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to state "filtering said received search results based on the electronic program guide". Support for the amendment can be found in Applicants' originally filed application at page 7, line 17- page 8, line 3. In contrast, neither Wise et al., nor Brodsky, nor Birdwell, et al., alone or combined, teach, suggest, or motivate using the electronic program guide both to constrain the search request and to filter the received search results. To better understand this point, consider the example where the user wants more information about the actress, Marilyn Monroe, in *Some Like it Hot*. While viewing that movie, the user utters, "Find me more information about the actress." The speech recognizer and natural language parser of applicants' system will process the utterance to extract a semantic representation of the user's request.

The applicants' system also stores an electronic representation of an electronic program guide that has an indicator identifying the program being enjoyed by the user at the time of the user's request (in this case, the movie *Some Like it Hot).*

Now, using (a) the semantic representation of the user's request and (b) the electronic program guide, the applicants' search engine commander issues at least one search request. The semantic representation and electronic program guide constrain the search request.

When the search results are returned, there may be hundreds or thousands of "hits" on the name Marilyn Monroe. Those hits may lead to information ranging from her movie acting career, to her relationship with a former U.S. President, to her untimely death, and to many other topics. This may be too much information for the user to deal with. The applicants' invention addresses this "information overload" problem by using the electronic program guide as a filter to process the received search results, thereby providing a filtered portion of the received search results to the user. Thus, the applicants' system actually uses the electronic program guide for two purposes: (a) constraining the search request based on the semantic representation of the user's utterance and (b) filtering the received search results. The references of record are quite different from this.

For example, Wise et al. does not teach an electronic program guide or filtering search results and the Examiner does not rely on Wise et al. in this capacity. Also, Brodsky fails to teach an electronic program guide that inherently contains information about programs available for viewing regardless of whether they have been viewed by the user. Brodsky also fails to teach any sort of filtering even based on closed captions.

In particular, Brodsky relies on "A service provided by the movie program producer, broadcaster or a dial-up service provider, that gives program relevant information upon a user's request.", (column 6, line 45-48). As a result, Brodsky ensures that retrieved information is inherently related to broadcast content available to the user. Further, Birdwell et al., do not teach filtering diverse information such as that available over the Internet based on an electronic program guide. Moreover, the claimed combination of Brodsky, Birdwell, and Wise to arrive at the present invention would impermissibly change the principle of operation of the teaching of Birdwell by causing it to filter based on an EPG, thereby rendering it inoperable for its intended purpose (See MPEP § 2145 III, see also MPEP § 2143.01); such a modification would require that Birdwell essentially cease filtering programming announcements since use of an EPG to filter the EPG has no utility within the teaching of the present invention or the cited references. Thus, none of the cited references disclose, suggest, or motivate all of the elements present in claim 1, especially as amended. These differences are significant.

As a result, Applicants' claimed invention is patentable respective of the teachings of these cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) along with the rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2003

By: Grey Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600